



## Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact [support@jstor.org](mailto:support@jstor.org).

direction that "une ferme s'ouvre pour faire voir la chambre," whereas, at the same time, most of the successors of Mahelot employ a single *tableau*, often in the form of the *palais à volonté* as exemplified by Corneille.

The second important point made by Lancaster is that the unified *tableau* came to the French largely from the ancients, through the medium of the Italian Pastoral. Mairet, a practical writer, had imitated the Italians. Doubtless, the critics, especially Chapelain, were also a strong influence for dramatic unity. But it was mainly the representation of regular plays, written in direct imitation of ancient and Italian models, that led to the simplification in question. We must agree with Lancaster that the "unities," powerful as they were, never held complete sway: the *Comte d'Essex*, a tragedy by Thomas Corneille in 1678, still calls for changes of scenery. On the other hand, the tendency was toward simplification, and Lancaster might fittingly have mentioned the preoccupation the elder Corneille reveals in his early *Examens* as to the unity of place—a preoccupation which again may have been due to practical stage considerations.

Unfortunately there is no room to dwell here on the many other matters—costuming, individual properties, artistic qualities—upon which the *Mémoire* throws light. Suffice it to add that Professor Lancaster's edition is a model (in everything except binding) of what such an edition should be. The text is clearly and accurately printed, the Introduction and the Notes are adequate and to the point, and the arrangement of the volume makes it handy for reference. The material aspect of the book owes much to its progressive French publisher, M. Champion, who has thus again shown his interest in the products of American scholarship.

WILLIAM A. NITZE

UNIVERSITY OF CHICAGO

---

*Forschungen zur Artusepik: I. Ivainstudien.* By RUDOLPH ZENKER.

(Beiheft zur Zeitschrift für romanische Philologie, No. 70.)

Halle: M. Niemeyer, 1921. Pp. viii+356.

The value of attempting a critical appraisal of so important a question as the origin of the *Ivain* is self-evident. Where conflicting views abound it is especially worth while to take stock, particularly when the reviewer is as gracious and open-minded a person as Professor Zenker. But the present volume is more than a mere survey. It is divided into three clear-cut parts: (1) a complete bibliography; (2) a discussion of the various theories as to the source of the Old French poem; and (3) an attempt to settle the relationship of the *Ivain* to the Welsh *Owain*. In this last part of his study Zenker agrees with A. C. L. Brown (*Romanic Review*, III) that the two works were derived from a common source, now lost; but he reaches

this conclusion after independent research, which enables him not only to confirm but to enrich Brown's arguments in several respects.

If there is one fact that stands out clearly after a perusal of Zenker's treatise, it is that the *Ivain* (like most of Chrétien de Troyes' romances) is a composite work, consisting of two—I should prefer to say "three"—fairly distinct strains. The most obvious strain is of course Chrétien's interpretation of his material in terms of chivalric romance—in short, the love-story. The second strain, pointed out too recently for Zenker to take account of it (see F. E. Guyer, *Romanic Review*, XII), is Chrétien's enrichment of his material with stylistic borrowings from Ovid and possibly Vergil. And, finally, there is the underlying material itself, beyond the peradventure of a doubt, an original folk-tale.

According to Brown, this folk-tale is of Celtic origin. The proof of this fact lies in the "scenario" of the *Ivain* with its well-developed Fairy Mistress theme and its otherworld appurtenances. This view Zenker accepts, although it should be noted that, while Brown repeatedly speaks of the folk-tale as "a Celtic fairy mistress story of the *type* of the Irish *Serglige Conculaind* and the Welsh 'Pwyll and Arawn'" (*Romanic Review*, III, 151), Zenker derives the folk-tale from "einer nicht erhaltenen irischen Erzählung von der Fahrt Cuchulinnns, des Haupthelden der älteren irischen Sage, in die andere Welt" (p. 169). In this case, clearly, Brown's statement is justified, whereas Zenker's is not. If the *Ivain* were actually derived from a version of the Cuchulinn legend, we should expect it to contain actual vestiges of borrowing from the *Serglige* (such as names, incidents, and so on), and that is not the case. The *Serglige* furnishes the closest parallel to the "scenario" of the *Ivain* that has yet been found, a "scenario" found in other Fairy Mistress tales of the Irish and the Welsh; hence Brown's contention that the *type* of story represented by the *Serglige* is also the *type* of story found in the *Ivain*.

But another type of story paralleling the *Ivain* is the Arician Diana myth and, in part at least, the Phrygian tale of Cybele and Attis. The former was pointed out by me (*Modern Philology*, III and VII) and the latter by Settegast (*Antike Elemente im altfranzösischen Merowingerzyklus*, 1907, and *Das Polyphemmärchen in altfranzösischen Gedichten*, 1917). Both of these tales are discussed by Zenker, who, besides adducing all available material, shows that the "vegetation" rites underlying them reappear in the following details of the *Ivain*: (1) the defense of the fountain, involving the challenge, the combat and the succession of "the slain by the slayer"; Esclados=the Rex Nemorensis (Diana story); (2) the sacred tree, whose branches are covered with song birds (Attis story); (3) the desertion, madness, and return of the lover (Attis story); (4) the *Dameisele sauvage* and the Giant Herdsman as parallel figures to *Silvanus* (Diana story) and to Pan (Cybele story); (5) the Forest of Broceliande and its fountain compared to the sacred Grove of Aricia and the spring *Egeria* (Diana story);

(6) the rain-making fountain compared with the fact that both Diana and Cybele have the power to make rain (Zenker, pp. 100 and 116); (7) the curious *Fil au Netun* (*Ivain*, ll. 5512 ff.) resembling in their armor and general behavior the ancient Kouretes and Korybantes, attached to the worship of Cybele (see now Miss Weston, *From Ritual to Romance*, p. 85).

When I wrote my last article on *Ivain* (1909) I was of the opinion that Chrétien, or rather the *conteur* who served as his immediate source, had retold a local Gallic fountain story (similar to the Diana story) in terms of a Celtic Fairy Mistress plot. Since the Fairy Mistress plot occurs in all of Chrétien's Arthurian romances except the *Cligès*, such a hypothesis is not unreasonable. At the same time, I tried to guard against error by concluding: "All I have sought to establish is that the kernel of the *Yvain* consists in the Defense of the Lady of the Fountain, the *theme* of the Arician Diana myth." On the other hand, Zenker now propounds the theory that since the oriental cults were carried westward by the Romans (see Cumont and others), we may assume that the Attis and Diana stories underlay the particular form of the *Serglige Conculaind* from which the *Ivain* was ultimately derived.

It is true Zenker expresses this view as a working hypothesis and not as an established fact. But even with this necessary reservation the theory seems to me unsound. As Brown has shown, a study of the stories connected with Cuchulinn show two facts as regards the source of the *Ivain*: (1) that it was an Otherworld-story; (2) that it was Celtic. Since the Welsh and the Bretons are Celts, and since Broceliande lies in Brittany, this source, whatever the ultimate origin of the story, probably was Welsh or Breton, i.e., before it was taken up by the *conteurs*. Hence if a vegetation-cult lay back of the source (and this seems probable), why go to Ireland to seek it rather than to Wales or Brittany? Fountain stories were common in Wales and Gaul (see *Modern Philology*, VII, and Hamilton, *Romanic Review*, II); they may have originated there in response to imported oriental cults; more likely they were due to a contamination of oriental cults with local forms of nature-worship. If Zenker will take account of the new material adduced by Miss Weston (*From Ritual to Romance*), he will realize more fully than at present the popular ritualistic elements in the Grail story (see *Modern Language Notes*, XXXV, 352 ff.). Some connection there is, too, between Wolfram's *Imâne von der Beäfontane* (*Parzival*, Book III), the various *pucelles as puits* of the Arthurian romances, and the *Imona* of the Poitou tablet transcribed by Jullian (*Revue Celtique*, XIX, 172). However this may be, the fact is that neither the Irish *Serglige* nor the Roman Diana story needs to have been an actual source of the *Ivain*; its origin is amply explained if we assume that it was derived from a Celtic (i.e., Welsh or Breton) folk-tale having otherworld, ritualistic characteristics—characteristics which the *Serglige* and the Diana myth help us to understand. It is this important conclusion that Zenker's treatise permits us to reach, and

until further new material is discovered no other conclusion seems to me possible.

As to the second part of Zenker's study, there is room to state only that he makes out an excellent case for Brown's theory "Of the Independent Character of the Welsh *Owain*." In arriving at this decision Zenker adduces material found not only in the *Mabinogion* but also in the Middle High German *Wolfdietrich*, Hartmann's *Iwein*, and Fietrer's *Iban* (about 1500). While several of his arguments are doubtless open to question, his main contention seems to me sound, particularly in view of Chrétien's method of making a *belle conjointure* (see Erec) out of the story-material he had at hand. In the Welsh the separate episodes are still woven loosely about the name of the hero, whereas in *Iwain* we have a conscious artist's attempt to unite them into a connected whole. But true fairy stories can be told only by those who believe in them; this fact accounts for the marked inconsistencies of detail in which most of Chrétien's romances abound. In spite of this fact the *Iwain* still is unmistakably the tale of

cele qui prist  
Celui qui son seignor ocist.

WILLIAM A. NITZE

UNIVERSITY OF CHICAGO

*Die irische Helden- und Königsage bis zum siebenzehnten Jahrhundert.*

By RUDOLPH THURNEYSEN. Teil I und II. Halle (Saale):  
Max Niemeyer, 1921. Pp. xii+708.

*Die irische König- und Heldensage*, by Professor Rudolph Thurneysen, is the most significant work on the epic literature of Ireland that has appeared since O'Curry's well-known *Manners and Customs* and *Manuscript Materials*, published nearly a century ago. It admirably fulfils its purpose, which, as set forth by the author, is to investigate the methods of Irish saga writers and to facilitate the study of literary sources and derivatives by determining as far as possible the interrelations of the documents examined.

The volume under consideration is divided into two sections. The first discusses the manuscript sources, the chronology of early Irish literature, and the status of the poet in early Ireland; the second contains summaries of the chief sagas of the Ulster and allied cycles, and points out evidences of literary interdependence. Similar investigations of the Finn saga, the so-called Mythological Cycle, and the Irish redactions and translations of foreign romances are in preparation, but whether, under present conditions, they can be completed in the near future, is, in the author's opinion, doubtful.<sup>1</sup>

<sup>1</sup> Of the unpublished parts Professor Thurneysen writes: "Es soll . . . der Titel ja nicht etwa andere abhalten, den Teilen, die ich als III-V ausangesetzt hatte, ihre Arbeit zuzuwenden, und sie in meinem Sinn oder in anderer Gestaltung auszuführen" (p. iv). A study of the Finn saga along lines somewhat similar to those followed by Professor Thurneysen was begun at my suggestion several years ago by Professor R. D. Scott, of the University of Nebraska, and is now nearing completion.